

Theology
Bound 2.

A
TRUE STATE
OF THE
CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN THE
Bishop of Bangor,
AND THE
Reverend Dr. *SNAPPE*.

Wherein are contained

The ARGUMENTS on both
Sides, with an Account of the
BISHOP'S ANSWER to the
DOCTOR'S LETTER.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *J. Sackfield* in *Lincoln's-Inn Square*,
and *T. Warner* in *Pater-Noster-Row*, 1717.

Price Six Pence.

THE
 OF THE
 COMPTROLLER
 BETWEEN THE

Bishop of Bangor
 AND THE

Reverend Mr. J. A. P. E.
 Wherein are contained



THE ARGUMENTS on both
 sides, with an Account of the
 Bishop's ANSWER to the
 Doctor's LETTER.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. Jackson in Lincoln's-Inn Square,
 and T. Winton in Pall-mall, 1717.

Price Six Pence.

TRUE STATE OF THE Controversy, &c.

TH E Bishop having been pitched upon to be one of the *Lent*-Preachers before his Majesty, when it was his Turn to mount the Pulpit on Sunday, March 31. 1719. took for his Text the 36th Verse of the xviiiith Chapter of the Gospel of St. John. *Jesur answered, My Kingdom is not of this World.* Which he was thought to handle so well, that he had it in Command from his Majesty to Print it. Accordingly it saw the Light some time after, under the Name of *The Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ*; and his Lordship having given Offence some time before, by some Positions laid down in a Pamphlet of his, intituled, *A Preservative against the Principle and Practices of the Nonjurors both in Church and State*; or, *An Appeal to the Consciences and Common Sense of the Christian Laity*; and did not want for very curious Enquirers after the Orthodoxy of the Doctrines contain'd therein. Amongst others, Dr. Snape, tho' a very hearty Well-wisher to the Government, and actually in his present Majesty's Service, in the Quality of One of his Chaplains in Ordinary, took the Sermon in Hand.

To begin with the Bishop himself, who may be thought by some, and not without Reason too, from the Tendency of his Discourse, to act in Concert with the Addresses from *Buckinghamshire*, and elsewhere, that are for Repealing the Acts of Schism, and other Unqualifying Acts, passed against the Dissenters; after he has spoken of the *Abuse of Words*, and the wrong Signification given them,

and instanc'd particularly in Two, *Religion* and the *Word of God*, which the Doctor, his Antagonist, owns often to have been misapplied, gives the following Definition of PRAYER.

B I S H O P.

Prayer, in all our Lord's Directions about it, and particularly in that Form which he himself taught his Followers, was a calm, undisturbed *Address to God*, under the Notion of a *Father*, expressing those Sentiments and Wishes before him, which every sincere Mind ought to have. But the same *Word*, by the Help of Men, and voluminous Rules of Art, is come to signifie *Heat and Flame*, in such a Manner, and to such a Degree, that a Man may be in the *best Disposition* in the World, and yet not be devout enough to *Pray*. And many an honest Person hath been perplex'd by this Means with Doubts and Fears of being uncapable of *Praying*, for want of an *Intenseness* of *Heat*, which has no more Relation to the Duty, than a Man's being in a *Fever* hath to the Sincerity of his Professions, or *Addresses* to any *Earthly Prince*.

To this the Doctor, after saying, I shall need no Apology for a Conduct towards your Lordship, which is warranted by your own Example. I have certainly the same Right to offer my Exceptions to a Sermon of your Lordship's, which your self thought fit to assume, when but a Presbyter, in censuring a Discourse of a late excellent and worthy Prelate, tho' recommended to the World by the like high Authority to that which graces your Lordship's Title Page, replies;

D O C T O R.

Your Lordship appears very unfavourable to any Thing that is External in the Service of God. To make Amends for which, one might, at least, have expected to meet with a very abundant Zeal, and more than ordinary Concern for that Part of Religion, which is seated in the Heart. But when, instead of that, we find you striking at the very Root of all Goodness, depreciating the solemn Duty of Prayer, by separating Devotion from it, which is the Life and Soul of it; how Shocking is the Disappointment.

What, my Lord, is Piety become so predominant in the Age, that the exorbitant Growth of it must be check'd? And is it to be check'd by such Hands? Does the Fever of Devotion rage so fiercely, as to stand in need of such cooling Prescriptions;

The Word (Prayer) by the Help of Men, and voluminous Rules of Art, is come to signifie Heat and Flame—— in the best Disposition in the World, and yet not Devout enough to Pray——Intenseness of Heat——being in a Fever: Very witty indeed! pretty Ironies in the Mouth of a Christian Bishop on so serious and sacred a Subject! This I am sure is touching the Vitals of all that is Good, and consequently, by your Lordship's own Allowance, ought in Duty to be resisted with a more open and undisguised Zeal than ordinary.

Nothing sure can be more contrary to the whole Stream and Tenour of the Sacred Writings, than what your Lordship has taught in this Paragraph, with reference to Prayer. You are pleased to call it a *calm and undisturbed Address to God*, and plead your Lord's Directions about it, in justification of your Notion. But no such Direction appears in Scripture. He cautions his Followers indeed against vain Repetitions and Ostentation, when they Pray; he censures the *Pharisees* for making long Prayers only for a Shew: But where does he say, that Prayer must be Calm and Undisturbed, or use any other Expression of the like Importance? Where does he attempt to moderate or assuage the Fervour of inward Devotion, or warn his Disciples against making their Requests to the Father with too much Vehemence?

So far from that, that we expressly read, he spake the Parable of the Widow and the unjust Judge, *Luke xviii. 1. To this End, that Men ought always to Pray, and not to Faint; i. e. to be urgent and importunate, and to sollicit with Earnestness*; as farther appears by the Parable of the Man that borrowed three Loaves of his Friend at Midnight, *Luke xi. 5.* By that of the *Publican*, who smote upon his Breast, in a deep Compunction of Soul, and humble Sense of his own Unworthiness, when he consider'd how great a Sinner he had been: By the Directions, he gives them to ask, seek and knock: From none of which Circumstances can we be encourag'd to hope, that God will hear our Prayers, if they are cold and lifeless,

But Prayer, you say, in that Form which our Lord taught his Followers, was *calm and undisturbed*. Most certainly it was not so at the Delivery, tho' it may be attended with those Properties in the Use, which depend on the Affection of him that uses it. Your Lordship may be *calm and undisturbed*, when you say the *Lord's Prayer*: But, I hope, there are those who repeat it with warmth and a lively Emotion of Spirit.

But

But nothing can more convincingly assure us, what was our Saviour's Will in this Case, than his own Practice. And did he satisfy himself, when he pray'd, with a little Devotion as would serve your Lordship? Was He quite so indolent and unmov'd, *Luke xxii. 44. when being in an Agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his Sweat was as it were great Drops of Blood falling down to the Ground.*

If there needed any farther Proof, I could put your Lordship in mind of St. Paul's Commendation of *Epaphras*, *Col. iv. 12.* who, he tells the *Colossians*, laboured fervently for them in Prayer; and of St. James's Assertion, *ch. v. 16.* That the effectual fervent Prayer of a Righteous Man availeth much: With a multitude of other Texts, as full and apposite as any that have been cited. And now pray, my Lord, consider, how very different a Notion any common Capacity may form, upon a perusal of these Scriptures, from those which your Lordship labours to inculcate. 'Tis indeed amazing to me, with what possible View you could attempt so sound a Doctrine, of a most pernicious Tendency in it self, on the Ruins of so many Texts of Scripture, unless it were to give a Specimen, in your own Person, of the Fallibility, or something worse, of human Interpreters.

Again upon the same Head, says the Doctor, Your Lordship plainly opposes Heat and Flame, to that Calmness and Undisturbedness with which you would have our Addresses to God accompanied. And if you had meant to allow of any, the smallest Degree of Fervour or godly Transport that might disorder that Tranquillity, and put the Soul into any kind of Agitation, it had been fair; and surely it was highly requisite to have told us how far your Concessions extended. Could not one Line be afforded, in a Case of so much Consequence, to guard against Mistakes, and to satisfy us in proper and direct Terms, that you did not mean to stifle all pious Breathings of the Soul, nor totally to extinguish all Sparks of Devotion? But, in Truth, as the Matter is represented by your Lordship, there are many who apprehend you; and who cannot conceive how, according to your Lordship's Dictates, there can be any Room left for Elevation of Thought, in contemplating the Majesty of God; for Acts of Shame and Abhorrence, and godly Contrition, when we are humbled with a sense of our Guilt; for a sprightly Joy and Exultation, under the Assurance of Pardon; for greatful Ejaculations, when we reflect on God's Mercies; nay, not even for

for the Hope of everlasting Bliss, or the Fear of everlasting Misery. Our Passions must all be stupified, and every Power of our Souls lye dormant and becalm'd, for fear of discomposing that easy Serenity with which your Lordship would have us Pray.

B I S H O P.

As the *Church* of Christ is the *Kingdom* of Christ, he himself is *King*; and in this it is imply'd, that he is himself the *sole Law-giver* to his Subjects; and himself the *sole Judge* of their Behaviour in the Affairs of *Conscience* and *Eternal Salvation*. And in this Sense therefore *his Kingdom is not of this World*; that he hath in these Points left behind him no visible human *Authority*, no *Viceregents*, who can be said properly to supply his Place; no *Interpreters*, upon whom his Subjects are absolutely to depend; no *Judges* over the *Consciences* or *Religion* of his People: for if this were so, then any such absolute *Viceregent* Authority, either for the making *new Laws*, or interpreting *old ones*, or judging his *Subjects* in religious Matters, were lodg'd in upon Earth, the Consequence would be, that what still retains the Name of the *Church of Christ*, would not be the *Kingdom of Christ*, but the *Kingdom* of those Men vested with such an Authority. For whoever hath such an *Authority* of making *Laws*, is so far a *King*; and whoever can add new *Laws* to those of *Christ*, equally obligatory, is as truly a *King* as *Christ* himself: Nay, whoever hath an absolute Authority to interpret any written or spoken *Laws*, it is he who is truly the *Law-giver* to all Intents and Purposes, and not the Person who first wrote or spoke them.

If any Men upon Earth have a Right to add to the *Sanctions* of his *Laws*, that is, to encrease the Number, or to alter the Nature of the *Rewards* and *Punishments* of his Subjects, in Matters of *Conscience* or *Salvation*; they are so far *Kings* in his stead, and reign in their own Kingdom, and not in *his*. So it is, whenever they assume to themselves *Tribunals*, and exercise a *Judgment* over the *Consciences* of Men; and assume to themselves the Determination of such Points as cannot be determined, but by *One* who knows the *Hearts*; or when they make any of their *Declarations* or *Decisions*, to concern and affect the State of *Christ's Subjects*, with regard to the Favour of God: This is so far the taking *Christ's Kingdom* out of his Hands, and placing it in their own.

The *Sanctions* of *Christ's Law* are *Rewards* and *Punishments*. But of what Sort? Not the *Rewards* of this World, nor the
Offices

Offices or Glories of this State; not the Pains of Prisons, Banishments, Fines, nor any lesser, or more moderate Penalties; nay; not the much lesser negative Discouragements that belong to Human Society. He was far from thinking that *These* could be the Instruments of such a Perswasion, as he thought acceptable to God. But as the great End of his Kingdom was to guide Men to Happiness, after the short Images of it were over here below; so he took his Motives from that Place where his Kingdom first began, and where it was at last to end; from those Rewards and Punishments in a future State, which had no Relation to this World; and to shew that his Kingdom was not of this World, all the Sanctions which he thought fit to give his Laws, were not of this World at all.

Now, where-ever this is practis'd, whether in a great Degree or a small, in that Place, there is so far a Change, from a Kingdom which is not of this World, to a Kingdom which is of this World. As soon as ever you hear of any of the Engines of this World, whether of the greater or lesser Sort, you must immediately think that then, and so far, the Kingdom of this World takes Place. For if the very Essence of God's Worship be Spirit and Truth: If Religion be Virtue and Charity, under the Belief of a Supream Governour and Judge: If True, real Faith cannot be the Effect of Force; and if there can be no Reward, where there is no willing Choice; then in all, or any of these Cases, to apply Force or Flattery, worldly Pleasure, or Pain, is to act contrary to the Interest of true Religion, as it is plainly opposite to the Maxims upon which Christ founded his Kingdom; who chose the Motives that are not of this World, to support a Kingdom which is not of this World. And indeed it is too visible to be hid, that where-ever the Rewards and Punishments are changed from future to present, from the World to come, to the World now in Possession; there the Kingdom founded by our Saviour is, in the Nature of it, so far changed, that it is become in such a Degree, what he professed his Kingdom was not: That is, of this World; of the same sort with other common Earthly Kingdoms, in which the Rewards are worldly Honours, Posts, Offices, Pomp, Attendance, Dominion; and the Punishments are Prisons, Fines, Banishments, Gallies and Racks, or something less of the same sort.

DOCTOR.

This Church of Christ, according to your Lordship, is the Kingdom of Christ, and a Kingdom of which he is himself not only

only the sole King, but the sole Law-giver, the sole Interpreter of his own Laws; a Kingdom in which he neither acts himself, nor has invested any one else with an Authority to act for him. And you are pleas'd to infer, *p. 13.* by one of the strangest Consequences that ever was drawn from any Proposition, that *because* he never interposes himself, *therefore* he has left no Deputy: Which if he did interpose, there would certainly be no Occasion for; but at his Departure into Heaven, when he was no longer to govern his Church in Person, he provided for the good Government of it by others whom he commissioned to teach and expound his Laws, to bear Rule and Authority over his Subjects, to be his Vicegerents to act in his Name and Stead, and so perpetuate a Succession of them through all succeeding Ages in the World, in whom the same Powers should be lodged; and though he made none of them Infallible, nor exempted them from human Frailties, yet still he required his Church to obey them, and to be guided by their Instructions, where they were not contrary to his.

Let us consider the Church under any other of those Images by which it is represented in Scripture, and we shall find that they all combine to give us an Idea of it as of an orderly and well-govern'd Society. Sometimes it is figur'd to us under the Similitude of a natural Body: But does that consist of disjointed Members, loosely put together, and connected by no Sinews, or Ligaments? No more can the spiritual Body, without Rules and Orders, which are the Bands and Ligaments of Society. We are often said to be united in one Body under Christ our Head, *Ephes. iv. 16.* *From whom the whole Body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every Joint supplieth, according to the effectual Working in the Measure of every Part, maketh Encrease of the Body, unto the edifying it self in Love,* And he who is our Head, *ver. 11, 12.* gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry, for the edifying of his Body.

Take the Church as a Building, as such it is called, *1 Per. ii. 5.* *Ephes. ii. 20.* *One spiritual House built upon the Foundation of Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the Chief Corner Stone.* And Christians are compared to a Building fitly framed, growing to an holy Temple in the Lord, *Eph. ii. 21.* Can a Heap of uncemented Stones compose such a Building fitly framed? No more can a Number of Men calling themselves Christians, but under no Body's Gover-

nance or Direction, compose a spiritual Edifice. Can a material Fabrick be of long Duration, with no one to survey it, to repair its Breaches, and prevent its Decay? No more could the Building of Christ's Church. Let us look upon the Body of Christians, as the Members of a large Household, or Family. In that there must be Stewards, and other governing Servants of different Degrees, to preserve a good OEconomy. Let us consider them as Souldiers fighting under Christ's Banner, and there we shall see Occasion for General and Subaltern Officers. And the Case will be still the same, if you take a View of the Church under any other Image.

If any Man upon Earth have a Right to alter the Sanctions of Christ's Laws, that is, to encrease the Number, or alter the Number of the Rewards and Punishments of his Subjects, &c. that is to say, If any King, Parliament, State, or Potentate, or any earthly Power whatsoever, shall encourage Religion by any temporal Rewards, or discourage it by any temporal Penalties, they usurp the Dominion of Christ, and dethrone him from his spiritual Kingdom.

This bears very hard indeed on the Acts for preventing *Occasional Conformity*, and Schism, and let us suppose the Argument were to have its Effect towards reverling of them: How does your Lordship know it will stop there? How can you be sure that the Enemies of our Constitution will not borrow it of you, and apply it to their own Purposes? For if it were true, that no Men upon Earth have a Power of enacting Laws, with Penal or Promissory Sanctions in Matter of Conscience, this would equally strike at all the Incapacitating Laws in Force; not only against Protestant Dissenters, but Papists too: Neither the one, nor the other, it seems, are to be employ'd under such exclusive Forfeitures, or negative Discouragements. Christ's Kingdom is not of this World, and none of the *Engines of this World* are to be employed for or against his Subjects.

The very Acts that secure the Protestant Succession, and have made it impracticable for any Papist to ascend the Throne, excluding for ever all of that Perswasion from such Claim as they might otherwise have a legal Title to, for no other Demerit, but purely for the sake of their Religion, must by this Reasoning be overthrown.

Nay, the very Act of Settlement, by vertue of which his present Majesty possesses the Crown, would stand upon no better a Foot; wherein it is provided, as one of the Limitations, *That whosoever shall hereafter come to the Possession of*
this

this Crown, shall join in Communion with the Church of England, as by Law established.

If your Lordship's Reasonings are right, there never was any Part of the Catholick Church, either in the Days of the Apostles, or at any Time since, in any Nation of the World, but has, as a Church, acted in direct Opposition to the Will of our Blessed Saviour, and usurped an Authority that he had never delegated. All who have been interpreting his Laws, have been making Laws for him. All impos'd Terms of Communion, according to your Lordship, are sinful, &c.

Thus all Articles and Creeds are destroyed at once, which were settled by Men so assembled. All Acts of General Councils were void and null from the Beginning. Nay, even the Decrees of the Council of Jerusalem, held by the Apostles themselves, were never of any Force; they sat there as Usurpers, they never had a Right to make any Laws, which belongs solely and peculiarly to their King Christ Jesus.

As the Town swarms with Answers and Remarks upon the Doctor's Letter, it is but fitting that the whole Catalogue of them should be run over, wherein are to be found no less than seven, under the following Titles. *The Layman's Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor. A Vindication of the Honour and Prerogative of Christ's Church. An Answer to a Letter to the Bishop of Bangor, written by one Andrew Snape, D.D. A Letter to Dr. Andrew Snape. A Letter to Dr. Snape, by a Layman of Honour and Conscience. A Rod for the Eaton Schoolmaster's Back. A Letter to the Scholars of Eaton.*

To begin with the first of these just spoken of, the *Layman*, after acknowledging the Obligations those of his Order are under for rescuing them from the Tyranny of the Clergy, he comments upon the Doctor's preceeding Remarks, after this manner.

L A Y M A N.

From such a Chain of Sarcasms one would conclude, that your Lordship had been endeavouring to overthrow the Whole of Christianity, and had a Design to extirpate Virtue from among Men; and that this Design was as fully and clearly express'd as Words could make it. How does he exult upon the Mention of a few innocent Words, which as used by him (*the Doctor*) are so far from having a bad Meaning, that they have no Meaning at all; and yet the Use of these, he is sure, is touching the very Vitals of

Christianity! Such a Rant is surprising from a Person so extoll'd by some People for his eminent Learning and good Sense; A Person intrusted on those very Accounts, with the Education of the Youth of one of the greatest Seminaries of Learning in the Kingdom.

But however, forasmuch as your Lordship has told us, we of the Laity are to judge for our selves; I shall see what is the natural Sense of the Paragraph, as it lies together, and how far the Doctor is right, or mistaken, in his farther Arguments upon it.

We naturally infer from hence, that your Lordship's genuine Meaning was to extinguish Devotion in Prayer; and that, in order to it, you have asserted a manifest Falshood, with respect to our Saviour's Directions about it. If this be not your Lordship's Meaning (as undoubtedly it is not) what shall we call these false Colours, Mistakes, or wilful Perversions? But his Abuse of your Lordship is here manifest. He omits now his Bead-roll of the Words, *Heat and Flame---devout enough to pray,---intenseness of Heat, &c.* which pleas'd him so much before, because he knew they would explain the Terms, *Calm and Undisturb'd*, and he had no other Way to pervert the Sense, but by destroying the Connection.

I must ask Leave therefore to give the Sense of your Lordship, as it appears to me: Of which there could be no need, it lying so plain in the Words themselves, but that this Gentleman has, by his Artifices, thrown his Reader's Mind into Confusion about it.

In every Place where our Saviour directs his Disciples to Pray, and particularly in the *Lord's Prayer*, he represents God under the Notion of a Father, and teaches them to express those Sentiments and Wishes before him, that every sincere Mind ought to have; which yet he was so far from directing to be offer'd up with that *Manner of Heat*, and *Degree of Flame*, of which the Essence of Prayer is now made to consist (to the Perplexity of many honest Persons, who fear they are incapable of Praying, for want of that Intenseness of Heat) that That compleat Form it self is a calm, undisturb'd Address to God, under the Notion of a Father.

Certainly none but an Enthusiast can oppose the just and rational Doctrine here laid down by your Lordship; for all Men in their Wits, and unblinded by Passion, must see this Mention of Prayer in the Proof of your first Remark, was to restore it to its original Signification, for the sake of
those

those honest Persons who are perplex'd through Fears of being incapable of the Duty, as wanting that Degree of Flame made now essential to it.

But the Doctor having rais'd a false Scent, is resolved to follow it; and will oppose the Extreme he imagines in your Lordship, by seeming to maintain that which you condemn. And because he cannot call the Instance you mention, other than a calm Address, he has Recourse to other Places of Scripture, to support his Argument; all which, as far as I can see, do not at all serve his Purpose.

The first is the Parable of the Widow, and the unjust Judge, *Luke xviii. 1. To this End, that Men ought always to pray, and not to faint*; which the Doctor by an *i. e.* says is to be urgent and importunate, and to sollicite with Earnestness; which must be in a peculiar Degree of Heat, if he means to urge it against your Lordship, and not with that natural Importunity which your Lordship has said nothing against, and which cannot but attend the End mentioned, *viz. That Men should pray always, and not faint.*

And 'tis plain, that our Saviour in this, and the other Places mentioned under this Head, suits his Parable to our Capacity, and speaks of God according to our Apprehensions of one another; that the only Design of them was to encourage our Perseverance in Prayer, and that our Faith in being answer'd, should not fail.

'Tis however true, as the Doctor says, *That from none of these Circumstances can we be encouraged to hope, that God will hear our Petitions, if they are cold and lifeless*: But that is a very different thing, I think, from *calm and undisturb'd*.

The Disingenuity of this Gentleman flagrantly appears in the next Paragraph: For after he has grossly misunderstood your Lordship, and brought the Terms *calm and undisturb'd*, (oppos'd by your Lordship to such a Manner of Heat, and Degree of Flame, as renders a Man without it, though otherwise in the best Disposition in the World, not devout enough to pray) to signify *cold and lifeless*, he then with a peculiar Strain of Wit, says, your Lordship may so say the *Lord's Prayer*; but out of his abundant Charity, he hopes there are some who repeat it otherwise.

By this time he hopes his Readers are not *calm and undisturb'd*; and therefore on this false Foundation he raises a pathetick Address to their Passions. What Influence his Declamation will have, or what Adherents he will gain over,

over, I am not able to foresee ; but I hope the Number will not be very large.

Then the *Layman* recites the last Paragraph of the *Doctor*, as abovemention'd ; and in Answer to it, says, I take it to be a sufficient Reply to this fine Rhetorical Flourish on what you have not said, That few can see your Silence a Fault, till they have set what you have said in a wrong Light.

After this, the Bishop's own Answer comes out to Dr. *Snape*, which is indeed a very modest Vindication of his Sermon ; wherein he takes no Notice of the Town Writers, in his Behalf, but proceeds by smooth Arguments to shew the Doctor some Mistakes in the Construction of his Lordship's Meaning ; and it is remarkable, that he gives another Turn to the Passages in his Sermon, than any of his Vindicaters, and without using the Doctor with that Scurrility the others have done, which may be said to be a Testimony, not only of the good Nature of the Bishop, but of the Inability of those scandalous Libellers, who pretend to list under his Banner. His Lordship's Answer to the Doctor's Letter begins as follows.

S I R,

I Do in the first Place assure you, that I am so far from being uneasy, either at your *thinking* in a different Way from Me ; or at your giving the World an Account of your Thoughts: that I esteem it your Duty both to judge for your self, and to *publish* what you judge necessary for the *Vindication* of the Honour of God, and of Religion. You needed not *My Example* to justify it. The *Importance* of the Matter, and the *Common Right* of Mankind, are much better Justifications. I only hope that *my Example* did not lead you into the *Manner* in which you have chose to do it. What hard and severe *Appellations* your *inward Conviction* and *private Belief* may have suggested to you, I cannot tell: They can hardly, I think, be worse than the *outward Expressions* you have been pleas'd to honour me with, in this Performance.

The first Charge is (p. 9) that you find me striking at the very Root of all Goodness, depretiating the solemn Duty of Prayer, by separating Devotion from it, which is the Life and Soul of it, &c. This is a very heavy Charge upon One, who knows that his Design was to strike at the Root of superstitious Folly, and

and to establish *Prayer* instead of it. But as heavy as it is, I am content to bear it, if any Words I have made use of are capable of such an Interpretation, by any Rules of Grammar, or Common Sense, in the World.

The *Instances* and *Texts* you allege against this, are

1. The *Parable* about the unjust Judge, spoken Luke xviii.
 1. To this End, that Men ought always to pray, and not to faint. Always to pray, and not to faint, is, in other Words, to pray without ceasing, as the *Apostle* expresses it. In your own Account it is, to be urgent and importunate, and to solicit with Earnestness, i. e. to repeat our Requests to God, as Persons who are truly in Earnest in what they ask. How this at all contradicts any thing I have said upon this Subject, I am still at a Loss to see; or how it fixeth any such particular Degree of Flame, or Heat, as necessary and essential to *Prayer*, which I complain to have been made so by the Help of Men and voluminous Rules of Art.

This, and the other *Parable* you next mention, of the Man borrowing three Loaves of his Neighbour at Midnight, Luke xi. 5. touch no Circumstance of *Prayer*, but the repeating it; nor is there any thing in either of Them, besides asking for the same thing, till the Judge and the Neighbour granted it, to avoid Trouble: Nor any thing signified by them, not by any Expression made use of in them, but that Our Prayers to God must be frequent.

2. The Representation of the Publican's smiting upon his Breast, as a Mark of Sorrow (which is your second Instance) was agreeable to this Custom of the Eastern Countries. But this is so far from entring into the Essence of the Matter, that no Man is either more or less sensible of his Sins, for striking, or not striking his Breast; for shedding, or not shedding Tears; or any the like Accidents depending upon Custom, or Constitution.

3. You mention next, the Directions our Lord gives his Disciples to ask, and seek, and knock. But neither asking, nor seeking, nor knocking, expresses any Circumstance of the Duty, or Temper of him who performs it, unless a real, and sincere Desire of Receiving, Finding, or Entering.

Your next Sentence is very surprising. From none of which Circumstances (here mentioned) can we be encouraged to hope that God will hear our Petitions, if they are Cold, and Lifeless. So that it seems Cold and Lifeless are only other Words for Calm and Undisturb'd. If you truly thought so, yet it would have been right to have let my own Words have stood, where you were drawing up the Strefs of your Argument against me.

me. But if you thought them Words of a different Sense, I know of no Justification of them, but this one, too common amongst Writers, That *every thing is lawful against the Man you dislike*. If the End of the Sentence had been express'd in my own Words, *Calm and Undisturb'd*, this had not been so shocking. The Zeal of a Reader could not, this way have been raised so high against an Adversary.

4. *Prayer*, (I say it again) is, in our Lord's own Form, a *Calm, Undisturbed* Address to God. Let it be read over a thousand times, and examin'd as often, I will venture to affirm, there is not a *Word*, or *Expression* in it, that tends to the raising any Disposition of Mind like to *Passion*, or *Perturbation*. In your great Civility, you are pleas'd to tell me, that I *may be Calm, and Undisturbed, in saying the Lord's Prayer*: i. e. as you had just before interpreted my Words, *Cold and Lifeless*; which in the next *Paragraph* you change for *Indolence and Unmov'd*. To which I have little other Reply to make, but that which a *Christian* ought to make to All hard Usage.

5. But you go on, and observe that *nothing can more convincingly assure us, what was our Saviour's Will in this Case, than his own Practice*. And for this, you appeal to *Luke xxii. 44.* where it is recorded that, *being in an Agony, he pray'd more earnestly, and his Sweat was, as it were, great Drops of Blood falling down to the Ground*. This you allege as a *Practice* of his, to assure us what was his Will; or, in other Words, what is our Duty, in daily constant Prayer: That is, you first call *This* a *Practice* of our Saviour, which he himself never but this once knew any thing of; and which was indeed the Effect of an unconceivable *Distress* of Soul, upon that one particular Occasion, to which we know nothing parallel; you then make *This*, which was the Effect of *Distress*, to be the Effect of *Devotion*; you make *This*, which was the Cause of his praying, to be the *Product* of it; and you make this *Temper* the Rule and Measure of our *Temper* and Disposition, when we pray.

From which many Things will follow, very disagreeable; and particularly, that our blessed Lord himself never truly prayed, before this time; because He never, as far as we know of, experienced any thing like this within himself.

6. You mention *Epaphras*, who laboured fervently in Prayer, *Col. iv. 12.* and the effectual fervent Prayer of a righteous Man, in *St. James ch. v. 16.* It is to little Purpose to observe to you, that there is nothing, in the *Original*, of the

the Words *fervently*, and *feruent*; which you print in remarkable Characters.

It is amazing, say you, to you, with what possible View I could attempt to found a Doctrine of a most pernicious Tendency in it self, on the Ruines of so many Texts of Scripture. My View in this Particular was, to rid the Minds of as honest Christians, as any in the World, from that great Uneasiness, which, (if I may guess by my self,) Ministers of Parishes must frequently meet with, arising from such Notions in Modern Books, or Discourses, as perplex them with Doubts about their Incapacity, even whilst They feel Themselves to be sincerely desirous and disposed to perform the Duty of Prayer. And, notwithstanding your critical Remark upon Comma's and Stops; (which, I confess, is either above my Capacity, or beneath it;) my Sense is so plainly there expressed, viz. that by the help of Men, and voluminous Rules of Art, the Word Prayer was come to signify Heat and Flame, in such a Manner, and to such a Degree, that a Man may be in the best Disposition in the World, and yet not be devout enough to pray, i. e. By those Rules, Men have been taught to work Themselves into Heat and Flame, in such a Manner, and to such a Degree, as something necessary to Prayer, that, according to those Rules, a Man may be in the best Disposition of Mind, and yet not be Devout enough to pray.

The Meaning here was so plain, that, after all your Severity, (p. 14.) you your self are suspicious, you have injured me. And you check your self, by saying, Or your Lordship might mean perhaps by those sarcastical Expressions, (as you are pleased to call them,) above-cited, only to reflect upon some Modern Books of Devotion, that recommend Fervency of Prayer. Sir, It is not only perhaps so, but certainly so: and this so certainly, that All your Zeal, and that of All your Friends put together, and all your Abilities likewise, cannot make the Sentence capable of any other Sense.

Your mention of my New Sect of Protestant Quietists may, for ought I know, be accounted Witty: but is certainly much more applicable to Those who contend for Disorder and Agitation of Soul, than to Those who contend against those Tumults of the Mind.

What my Notions of Prayer, and the Temper of Prayer, are, must by this time have appeared to all impartial Persons: I beg Leave just to mention, that it will farther appear, what They have long been, by publishing, as soon as I can conveniently, several Forms of Prayer, which were drawn up for private Use many Years ago; and which I

think, I have now a just Occasion to trouble the World with.

You next touch a little upon what I have said upon the Love of God : But you are very good here. You are so kind as to suppose that I intended my *Reflections* against Those who have *over-strained that Duty*, &c. That is, *Those*, against whom alone I could intend them. You might have been as good, under the former Head, where it was as plainly said : and then a great deal of Trouble had been saved. But even here, you cannot forbear your Complaint that I have *set it*, that is, The Love of God, *as low as possible* ; and that I *seem particularly careful that Men may not offend in the Excess of This, or any thing else that is Good*.

You come, p. 18. to the Consideration of the Nature of the Church of Christ : by which means I shall the better be able to do *You and my Self*, Justice.

1. The Church of Christ, you say, according to me, is the Kingdom of Christ. I really thought that All Christians, in the midst of All their Contradictions, still *professed* to believe that the Church of Christ was the Kingdom of Christ. I always thought indeed, that it would be much more consistent with many of their *Doctrines and Claims*, not to use that Expression. But I little thought to see the time, when it would be openly fix'd as a *peculiarity* upon any One particular Christian, that, according to him, the Church of Christ was the Kingdom of Christ.

In the mean while, I must stop a little to wonder what harm it could have done to the Cause of Truth, to have permitted *my own Sentiments* to have stood in *my own Words*. But this would not have done the Business so effectually. My Words are these. *Serm. p. 11. As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, He himself is King : And in this it is implied, That He is himself the sole Lawgiver to his Subjects ; and himself the sole Judge of their Behaviour, in the Affairs of CONSCIENCE, and ETERNAL SALVATION :— That He hath, in those Points, (viz. of CONSCIENCE and ETERNAL SALVATION,) left behind Him no visible, humane Authority ; No Vicegerents who can be said Properly to Supply his Place ; No Interpreters upon whom his Subjects are absolutely to depend ; No Judges over the Consciences or Religion of his People. This you think fit to represent, As if I had said, not only King, but Lawgiver, Judge, and Interpreter of his own Laws. Whereas, I say, He is not the sole King, if He be not the sole Lawgiver, and Judge ; and, as for his being Interpreter of his own Laws, I positively deny that*

He himself ever interposeth to assert the true Interpretation of them, p. 13.

You say, I represent the *Church of Christ* as a Kingdom in which Christ neither acts himself; nor hath 'nvested any one else with an Authority to act for Him. Lay your Hand upon your Heart, and ask, Is this a Christian, Humane, Honest, Representation of what your own Eyes read in my *Sermon*? What I say is, that *Christ* never interposeth, since His first promulgation of His Law, either to convey Infallibility—or to assert the True Interpretation of it——. If you oppose me in this; you maintain that *Christ* doth interpose, in order to convey Infallibility, or to assert the True Interpretation of his Law. Read this Proposition: and either affirm it to be true; or else acknowledge that you are far from representing, or contradicting, my Sense. His first promulgation of his Law, was his acting visibly with Kingly Authority in his Kingdom.

We now come to your own Sentiments, which you thus express, in the same Sentence, p. 19. *At his Departure into Heaven, when He was no longer to Govern his Church in Person, He provided for the good Government of it, by Others, whom He Commissioned to teach and expound his Laws, to bear Rule and Authority over his Subjects, to be his Vicegerents, to act in his name and stead, and to perpetuate a Succession of Men thro' all the succeeding Ages of the World, in whom the SAME Powers should be lodged. And tho' He made none of Them infallible, nor exempted Them from Humane Frailties, yet still He required his Church to obey Them, and to be guided by Their Instructions, where They were not contrary to His. The places of Scripture to prove these Assertions, are so numerous, &c.*

You have therefore added, *Tho' Christ hath made none of them infallible, yet still he requires his Church to obey Them.* How? Absolutely? Without reserve? Upon the Argument of Their Authority only? If not; I beg to know what is all this to me, declaring against an *Absolute Authority* in Men? And is This the whole which even you, at last can make of the Matter, after all your Boasted Zeal for *Mere Authority*? I beseech you, why may not I be allowed to say that no Man upon Earth hath an *Absolute Authority* in *Christ's Kingdom*, as well as you? Only because I stand to it, and do not unsay it again in other Places, to the great Diversion and Advantage of the *Roman Catholics*; and of the Enemies of all Religion? Now, Sir, If I am not to obey, where their Instructions are contrary to *Christ's*; or not: Unless you will order me to take their Word abso-

lutely That they are so. If I am to examine this, I am to be determin'd in it by my own Judgment and Conscience, and not by *Theirs*. If I find *Their Obstructions* agreeable to the *Will of Christ*, I obey them. Why? Not because of *Their Authority*, but because of *Christ's Authority*. I obey *Him*, not *Them*, by your own *Rule* here laid down.

As we pass, let me observe the only possible Meaning of those Words of mine, *Serm. p. 15.* which you greatly mistake, or abuse, *p. 27.* in order to shew that the Word *Absolute*, over and over again repeated by me, and several other the like Words, are not to be regarded in your *Representation* of my Sense: And then let all Men judge, how hard it is, to have my Sentiments laid before the World, not as they truly are, but as an *Adversary* wishes them to be, to encrease his own imaginary Triumphs. My Words are these—*If they, (i. e. any Men) have this Power of Interpreting, or adding Laws, and judging Men (now let the Reader observe) in Such a Sense, that Christians shall be Indispensably, and Absolutely obliged to obey those Laws, and to submit to those Decisions: Indispensably and Absolutely, obliged,* These are the Words; and Words which cut off all Examination and Consideration whether Those *Decisions* be contrary to *Christ's Will*, or not; and the Supposition at the Beginning is of *Christ's not interposing to direct, or rectify these Decisions*—If this be the Case, I say, *whether they happen to agree with Christ, or to differ from him, as long as they are the Law-givers and Judges, in the Sense there laid down, without any Interposition from Christ, They are Kings of this Kingdom, and not Christ Jesus.* Here the Case is put of *No Examination, No Consideration, whether their Decisions are contrary to Christ's Will, or not; (as in the Church of Rome) and of an absolute indispensable Obligation to submit to the Mere Authority of the Deciders. (as the Condition is of Christians in that Church)* In this Case, I say, that *This is the Kingdom of these Men, and not of Christ, because they are obeyed absolutely and implicitly, without any Regard to Christ's own Decisions; and that it makes no Difference in this Case of Absolute and Indispensable Obedience, without comparing the Laws of Men with the Laws of Christ, whether the former happen to agree with the latter, or not. Still, as long as the Obedience is Absolute and Indispensable, it is Obedience to Men as Kings, and not to Christ. Is not this a Demonstration to the Eye-sight of the World, in the Ramish Church? And do you not see that this is nothing to us two, who agree in maintaining No such Absolute, Indispensable*

pensable Obligation to submit; but a *Right* not to obey when those Decisions are *contrary to Christ's*; which is built entirely upon a *Right* to examine whether they are so, or not. Read therefore your 28th Page, where you represent *me* as equally pleading *against all Commands, &c.* and compare it with your own Acknowledgment, that Christians must not obey any Commands of Men, when they are *contrary to Christ's*.

P. 20. You go on (after having spoken about the *Apostles Days*) to say, *If Christ had made no Provision, by substituting Vicegerents to act for, and under him, to satisfy the Doubts of his People, and explain the Meaning of his Laws, by comparing them with one another, to restrain Offenders, and keep in Awe the Disturbers of its Peace and Unity: If no Care had been taken—— to keep his Subjects in Order, the Church of Christ must have been a Babel, and his Kingdom a Realm of Confusion.* Now apply your own Limitation, that no Christian is to obey these *Substitutes* or *Vicegerents*, where their Instructions and Directions are *contrary* to those of Christ, of which every Christian is to judge: And then determine whether this Objection ought to affright us from maintaining Christ's Right to be obey'd in Opposition to these *Substitutes*, when the Case so happens; or from defending his Subjects against all such Absolute Authority as lays them under an Obligation to a blind and implicit Obedience.

If they again urge *us* (as you go on p. 21.) *with any other of those Images*, under which the Scripture represents the Church as an orderly, well-govern'd Society; we can answer them, that we can never think Christ's Church so well-govern'd a Society, as when Christ's Laws govern it; that we have not said one Word against the Order, or the good Government of it; but only asserted the Right and Duty of all Christians, to consider the Laws of Christ himself, because we are sure of his Displeasure, if we obey any Authority upon Earth contrary to his Will; and that we are for all Order and good Government consistent with that Right of not obeying against our own Consciences; which he did not to be sure destroy by any *Images* of Order and Decency, under which his Church is represented. Take it under the Figure of a *Body*, a *Building*, a *large Family*, (why not a *small one*, when that cannot alter the Case, as to the Essentials of it?) or take it as an *Army*, or as what you please; these all help to clear up what I have said, and what your kind Limitation before-mention'd implies in it. If it be a *Body*, the *Head* is *Christ*; if a *Building*, the

Foundatten-Stone is *Christ*: and the *Apostles* themselves no otherwise *Foundation-Stones*, but as they are represented even by themselves, as the *Preachers* of what he immediately dictated to them. But as for all their Successors, they are not the Foundation, but Part of the Building it self erected upon that Foundation. If it be a *large Family*, then it follows, that no Servant of the highest Rank hath any Authority disagreeable to the Will of the Master of the Family; nor the other Servants any Obligation (supposing the Master himself absent, and to have left behind him his Will in Writing, for the Use of them all) to submit to the Dictates of any Servant of their Master, without comparing them with that written Will. But if it be consider'd as an *Army*, then it is plain, that the chief General is the Ruler of it; and that the Orders of the chief General, supposing them to be given by himself, for the Use of the Souldiers, in his Absence, are the Directions for the Souldiers in all their Service and Warfare. And I do not doubt, as you say, that *the Case is still the same, if you take a View of the Church under any other Image*. I have taught Men, and I do here declare, I will go on to teach them, *to receive no Commands relating to their eternal Salvation, from any Superiors, whether spiritual or temporal, absolutely and implicitly upon the Ground of mere Authority, without examining them by the Laws of Christ, and finding them agreeable to those Laws*.

All this which I have been now saying, will appear still more clearly, if possible, in the Answer which I am preparing to the *Representation* of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation.

P. 29. The Passage you are here disturbed at, about the *Altering* or *Adding* to the *Sanctions* of Christ's Law, is no more than this Syllogism. The Affixing the proper Rewards and Punishments to the Behaviour of Christians, as Christians, is an Act of Christ's Regal Power. Whoever alter the Nature of these, or add to them, do truly themselves affix Rewards and Punishments. Therefore, they are so far Kings themselves. That, according to me, they *Derhronc Christ* from his *Spiritual Kingdom*, is your own hard, and unjust Comment. But that, as far as they alter his Sanctions, or add new ones, that I say *so far*, they reign in their own Kingdom, is in my Opinion, as clear a Proposition as this, that, as far as *New Sanctions* are brought into *Christ's Religion*, so far *New Sanctions* are brought in. If Christ brought them in, or commanded them to be brought in,

in, they are his; if not, they are not his. If any others can, even by Right, bring them in; yet still it is true that these others are so far Kings.

You do me one Piece of Justice, p. 23. when you assure the World, in your Way, that *I have dealt my Favours with an equal and undistinguish'd Hand to all Churches and all Religions.* If you mean this by it, that I disdain the poor Sophistry of claiming that *mere Authority* to our selves, which we deny constantly to others; and that I do not think any Man's Religion, considered in it self, an Argument why he should be deprived of any of the common Rights of Society, in this World. But if you mean any thing else, I must assure you, it is your own Invention. The Exclusion of the Papists from the Throne, was not upon the Account of their Religion. All the World knows, that it was upon the Experience that they could not be trusted with the Rights and Liberties of the Nation.

But for one Christian Divine, who is endeavouring to preach Religion and the Gospel, to be told by another Christian Divine, that he contradicts Acts of Parliament, and Laws made by Men, would have a very odd Appearance, if any thing could be calmly considered amidst the Passions of Men. It cannot certainly be intended as an Argument, unless it rely upon this glorious Foundation, (becoming a Christian Divine to own) that every Preacher of the Gospel, instead of preaching all, and every thing which he finds there, is obliged to sit down and consider Human Laws, every Act of Parliament, and every Clause in every Act of Parliament; and to find, or make the Laws of the Gospel agreeable to them, before he presumes to preach, or to inculcate them. Neither Christianity, nor the Reformation, could have shewn their Heads against such irresistible Arguments as these.

From p. 34. to p. 37. you set forth the tragical Effects of my Doctrine, not only upon the Polity of the Church of England, but upon *All Ecclesiastical Polity*, as your Phrase is. And all this by Way of Consequences drawn from my Principles, without so much as referring to the Passages in which my Principles are laid down. *If my Reasonings are right, you say, there was never any Part of the Christian Church either in the Days of the Apostles, or at any time since, in any Nation of the World, that has not, as a Church, acted in direct Opposition to the Will of our Blessed Saviour, and usurped an Authority that he had never delegated.* This is a Charge indeed against all Churches, which I neither made, nor ever admitted

mitted into my Thoughts. We will try, if you please, from my Principles. Christ is sole Law-giver and Judge in Matters of eternal Salvation, and hath delegated no Absolute, (*i. e.* as you own) Unlimited Authority to Men, to which Christians are Absolutely (*i. e.* as you own) Unlimitedly, Unconditionally, without Examination obliged to submit in any thing contrary to his Will. This is all that I have taught. From hence you say it follows, the Apostles themselves, (as you farther explain it, p. 35.) and all Churches in their Days, and ever since, *usurped an Authority never delegated to them.*

Now, I confess, I always understood the New Testament it self to teach us, that the Apostles were directed by Christ himself, and by his Spirit. So that he was still in all which they ordain'd as Parts of his Religion, truly the Legislator and King. The Authority was his, in the strictest Sense, as they often professed; and they had no Authority to ordain any thing relating to eternal Salvation, but what he expressly and immediately revealed and dictated to them. They were *sent, taught, directed, immediately* by Christ. According to my Rule therefore, *wherever he be interposeth to convey Infallibility*, he is the Legislator, properly speaking. And that was the Case.

If the Case be otherwise with any Churches, I am heartily sorry; but I profess, I never knew, nor heard of any Church upon Earth, except the Church of Rome, in its latter corrupted Estate, which ever dared to claim such an Absolute Authority. And this Church it self first thinks it necessary to outface us, that *Christ doth still interpose to convey Infallibility*. What follows, I suppose, is to explain the Meaning of this; and therefore let us consider the Instances you mention.

1. According to my Reasonings, you say, *All who have been interpreting his Laws, have been making Laws for him.* I hope not, I am sure for my self, I endeavour to Interpret his Doctrine, without the Thought that all who hear me, are indispensably obliged to receive my Interpretation. You know, Sir, in your Conscience, that I have not said a single Word against any Interpretative Authority, even of the weakest Men, but an Absolute Authority of Imposing their Sense upon Christ's Laws. You know that you your self declare, No Christian is obliged to receive any *Interpretation contrary to Christ's Will*; to which therefore he is obliged to compare it always: And supposing it should be found, upon Enquiry; to be agreeable to it, he ought not, by

by your own Rule, as well as mine, to receive it before he finds it so. So that we stand in this and fall together. If these Consequences are so terrible against me, they are the very same against you.

2. So again in the Case of imposed Terms of Communion, I have declared in the Sermon against nothing but the absolute indispensable Obligation of Christians to submit to them, right or wrong, without examining whether they be agreeable to Christ's Will or not.

3. Again you go on, *Nor can any Number of Wise and Good Men, (according to my Reasonings,) agreeing together in the same Notions, and assembled by legal Authority, in due Subordination to the Civil Magistrate, though with the most unanimous Consent, establish any Rules, or Ordain any Method of Church-Government that shall be binding, even for Peace and Quiet's sake, to any others.* Here again, We must prevail or fall together. For, as to Conscience, (which is our Province, as long as we have any Consciences of our own left,) as to Conscience, I say, you have declared in this very Book, (the Force of Truth hath extorted it from you, in the midst of all your Zeal) that no such Decisions or Declarations are binding upon any Christian in the World, if they be contrary to Christ's Will.

This is your own Rule ; and therefore expose, vilify, use me as you please : I have this Satisfaction, that you come, your self, into this whole Condemnation ; and not only you, but indeed all, every Man of the Church of *England* ; every Man of those themselves, who have treated me in the same unhandsome Manner upon this Account.

In what follows, p. 36. I find we differ exceedingly about the Church we are speaking of. You have figured to your self a new Kind of Spiritual Kingdom ; a Spiritual Kingdom which you declare to flourish by Temporal Methods : A Kingdom not of this World, nourished by the Glories and Favours of this World, bestowed upon it by its temporal Nursing-Fathers and Nursing-Mothers. Look into the Popish Countries, and there you will find something under that Denomination, flourishing in these Methods ; a Part of it fed and pampered by Temporal Nurseries ; and the other Part starved and miserably treated. But look into the first Ages, you will find the Church of Christ a Spiritual Kingdom of such inward Strength and Vigour, as to be able to flourish equally in all it's Parts, (I say, to flourish,) not only without, but against, all the Temporal Powers of the Earth.

Many glorious Things have I read and heard on all Sides, about the flourishing Estate of the Church of Christ, before *Constantinople*; and many melancholy and terrible Accounts of its Condition, from and after that Time: Till by Degrees it became in the corrupt Estate of the Church of *Rome*, the Sink of Hypocrites, and the Sanctuary of Atheists. But I think verily you are the first Divine amongst Protestants, who has affirmed of the Reformation what must be equally true of Christianity it self, and indeed is agreeable to what goes before: That *the desirable Work was not compleated, till the earthly Rulers, being themselves converted, established and confirmed it by temporal Sanctions.* A Sentence, Sir, which, if duly considered, must be very shocking to every Christian Mind; unless the desirable Thing in Christ's Kingdom be Riches and Power.

I must here add, because I have been very much mistaken and misrepresented in this Matter, that I never affirmed, or thought, that even the greatest worldly Encouragements, annexed to any particular Professions, (as for Instance, in the Church of *Rome*;) did totally destroy all inward Principles of Religion; or do intirely, any where, root out of every Man's Mind Sincerity and real Belief.

If you, or any others, (who are all, at several Times, forced to say the same Things,) will please to conclude, that I had evil Intentions and bad Views; I cannot help it. You must, in Consequence, though not in Design, charge the same upon the Gospel: In which, I think, there is not a single Passage tending any other Way. I know my own Heart.

And they who have insinuated otherwise neither know me nor those Rules of Honour and Conscience, by which they ought to conduct themselves.

As to what follows, p. 37. it is universally own'd that the Papists were not at first excluded from Offices, on the Account of mere Religion; but solely on Account of their avowal of such Principles as naturally and unavoidably destroy the State.

But if you esteem Religion of that Nature, that it ought to be so treated in Humane Society, I am confirmed in this, that as by the Church of Christ, you mean something entirely different from what I mean by Expression; so, by Religion, you mean quite another Thing than I have been speaking about.

I know

I know of no Confusion, glorious or inglorious, that I have endeavoured to introduce, as you charge me, p. 37. The Church of Christ was as regular, as orderly, as glorious, as he designed it to be, in all Things belonging to its Nature, before the World came in to Nurse; that is, before the Order, and Regularity, and Glory, of Temporal Sanctions could come into it.

I have set forth the *Spiritual* Nature of Christ's *Spiritual* Kingdom, and the *Spiritual* Sanctions of *Spiritual* Laws. The Sum of the Whole is in these four Propositions. Christ's Kingdom is Christ's Kingdom. The Sanctions of his Laws must be the Sanctions which he himself hath fixed. The Sanctions in Humane Society ought in Reason to be taken from the Principles of Humane. Men ought not to suffer in their common Rights, for the sake of any mere difference of Opinion in Religion, considered as such.

If any one will infer from hence, that I argue against all Right of appointing Time, Place, or Ceremonies relating to religious Worship; against the Maintenance and Support of those who officiate in the Churches or Assemblies of Christians; against the Order or Decency, or Subordination, belonging to Societies of Christians; or any Thing against the Interest of the Church of *England*. I answer, that I not only do not own such Consequences, but I really do not see them. As for the Church of *England*, I regard it as a noble Part of the Catholick Church, founded upon the noble Claim of the Right of Christians to judge for themselves; and for the Principles of this Sermon,

What I maintain is the very Principle of the Protestant Church of *England*, as well as the Ground-work of the whole Reformation: And the greatest Service that can be done to the Church of *England*, is, to vindicate and inculcate it.

I am far from saying that I will answer for every Sentence, in every Book of mine, written long ago. I hope no Christian writes Books to preclude himself absolutely from enquiring after, or receiving, Truth for ever. But as the whole Tenor of the Reasonableness of Conformity, and the Principles of this Sermon; there is just the same Contradiction between that Book and them, as there is between my sincere Endeavour to convince a Man of an Error, and my not murdering or injuring him, if he be not convinced by what I say; or exactly the same as there

is between your vindicating the Church of *England* with so masterly a Zeal as you have here done; and telling the Dissenters, as you do at the same Time, that they are obliged not to comply with any Thing, whether Doctrine or Injunction, contrary to Christ's Will.

I wish you would explain the last Sentence of your Letter. I am far from designing either to fix Consequences upon you, which you do not own: Or any particular Interpretation upon your Words; even though it be the Interpretation, of which alone, both Friends and Enemies, as far as I can hear, agree them to be capable. But the Case is this. You plainly reproach me with an *Opposition, in my present Practice, to my former resisting Doctrines*. My present Practice is, all that Zeal, Duty, and Submission, which can result from the sincerest Affection to King George: My former resisting Doctrines, all the World knows, never taught any Resistance; but to the Worst of Princes, engaged in the Total Destruction of the Civil Rights of a Whole Nation. The Natural thought is, that *No one can reproach me with Contradiction in this Matter, without implying, (too strongly, I fear, to be denied,) that his present Majesty is—* what I care not to repeat.

This puts me in mind to congratulate you upon the Publick Honour lately done you, so soon after a Performance which ends with so remarkable a Sting. I have no Civilities to spend any Time in thanking you for. Perhaps your Notion of Religion is, that it forbids you to shew any to one from whom you sometimes imagine you differ. The want of them, and the Abundance of something in their stead, I pray God to forgive. I neither return you like Usage my self, nor am I pleased that any one else should. I sincerely wish you all Happiness here and hereafter: And am,

S. I R,

Your, &c.

BENJAMIN BANGOR.

Having

Having given some Account of the Controversy betwixt the Bishop and his Antagonists, we proceed next to the POSTSCRIPT of Mr. Trapp's, by way of Réjoinder, annex'd to his Sermon, which is as follows :

WHile this Discourse (*speaking of his Sermon*) was in the Press ; the World has been presented with *The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Bangor's Answer to the Reverend Dr. Snape's Letter*. That Excellent Person is too well able to defend himself, to need *any* Assistance, much less such as *mine*. I shall therefore, while we are expecting his Reply, only presume to take Notice of his Lordship's Letter, *so far as it affects my Sermon*, and no farther.

Some Parts of it, if I mistake not, are already answered in the Sermon it self ; by way of Anticipation, or by obviating Objections. For the rest ; I desire to be informed, what we are to think of a Writer, who expresses himself in such a manner, that Nobody can understand him ? For not only Dr. *Snape*, and myself, but all the Lower House of Convocation, and every Body else, as far as I can observe, have it seems been entirely ignorant of his Meaning. And *what sort of Meaning* must That be ? *A few particular Persons* indeed may, thro' Prejudice, and the Spirit of Contradiction, wilfully wrest, and pervert the Sense of an Author : but 'tis monstrous to suppose the same of *all Mankind*. And to all Mankind I appeal, to Adversaries, as well as Friends ; to Those who approve of his Doctrine, as well as those who dislike it ; whether they did not apprehend his Sermon to have some farther Aim, than a bare Denial of the Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, (for no other pretends to be infallible) and of the Consequences following from it : Especially, since in the whole Sermon, from the Beginning to the End, there is not one Word about that Church ; no such Word as *Rome*, *Romish*, *Popery*, or *Popish*, or any Expression equivalent. So that it was, God knows, in the Integrity of my Heart, that I said the Word *Infallibility* seemed to be thrown in purely by way of Amusement, as being nothing to the Purpose. I confess his Doctrine, if true, would effectually prove that no Church is infallible ; but then it would prove *much more* ; and 'tis for This Reason that we oppose it.

Nor does his explaining himself upon the Word *Absolute* at all mend the Matter ; but rather makes it worse than it was before. What I have already, tho' very briefly

ly, said upon it in the preceding Discourse (*i. e. his fore-mentioned Sermon*) seems to me sufficient : but we shall now be more particular. I said that as it is sometimes mentioned, so it is sometimes dropp'd : This the Reader may observe in several Passages which I have cited. I shall now repeat *one*, because it is very remarkable ; and tho' I have already produced it, yet it was with a different View. P. 16. " Whether (the Query, as it there appears, is equivalent to an Assertion) " this Notion of it (Christ's Kingdom) doth not *absolutely exclude* all other *Legislators*, and " Judges, in Matters relating to Conscience, or the Favour of God ; or whether it can be *his Kingdom*, if any " Mortal Men have such a Power of *Legislation*, and Judgment in it." Here, I confess, the Word *absolutely* is used, and 'tis used *emphatically* : But it is apply'd to *excluding*, not to the *Legislators*, and *Judges* : 'Tis not said that their *absolute Authority* is excluded, but that they are *absolutely excluded* ; which is much more. Nor can [such] before [Power] have any reference to that Word ; because it is not mentioned in the whole Paragraph. In which too it is asserted a little before, that no one of Christ's Subjects more than another *hath Authority*. The reading the whole Paragraph will make my Observation much stronger.

But admitting that either this Epithet, or this Adverb, were *always* inserted in its proper Place. He tells us that the Church has not an *absolute Authority*, *i. e.* not such a one as obliges us to obey, without (p. 28.) *Examination, or Consideration*, whether such Commands, are contrary to Christ's Will, or not : (Words, by the way, which are not to be found in the Sermon, but thought of since (Who says she has ? This is what No-body among us denies. But in discoursing farther upon it, He advances Doctrines of the same Tendency, and Reasonings equally inconclusive with Those which I have been considering in the foregoing Discourse. " If (says he) by an *Authority to act* " *for him* you mean an Absolute Authority to make New " Laws, or interpret Old Ones, relating to the eternal Salvation of Christians, and binding their Consciences absolutely ; I do indeed maintain it, that he hath " left no such absolute Authority in any *MAN* or *MEN*." And I beg leave to maintain the contrary ; according to the Sense in which I have explained my self already ; and which will further appear from what I have now to offer. It does not in the least make against my Assertion to say that the Subjects have a Right to examine ; and are not to obey

obey those Commands which were contrary to Christ's, which we all acknowledge. In this Case the Church hath not only no absolute Authority, but no Authority at all. And this indeed helps us to a Clue, which will unravel the whole Maze of the Fallacy. If the Church, or State, or both, have any Legislative Authority at all in Matters of Conscience or Salvation; it must be Absolute, as all Legislative Authority is and must be. So that in my Opinion his Lordship might as well, or better, have spoke out, and roundly asserted, that in these Points, the Legislature, both Ecclesiastical and Civil, hath no Authority whatsoever, than have raised such a Cloud of Dust, about the Word *Absolute*.

He says, p. 26, 27. that if upon Examination, he finds the Instructions (of Church-Governors) to be agreeable to the Will of Christ, he obeys them; but not because of their Authority, but of Christ's. If otherwise, We all grant he is not to obey them. True: But is there no Medium between these two Cases? Are there not some Things relating to Conscience and Religion, about which Christ hath determined nothing? And are not those the Objects of human Laws and Decisions? The Forms and Modes of Worship relate to Religion: Difficult Points in Scripture and Divinity relate to Conscience and Salvation: In both of these some Men have Authority to determine, and that absolute too if they had any Authority properly so called.

It is here to be observed, that his Lordship tells us how much Authority he does not allow; but not how much he does allow. For what he says, p. 48. about a "*Right*" (a very low Word, *Authority* would have been too high) "of appointing Time, Place or Ceremonies, relating to religious Worship, &c. is, according to his Doctrine, just Nothing. And therefore if he does not (*ibid.*) see the Consequence of it which he mentions, I think I do. For what signifies that Right in the Governors; if there be not in the Subjects an absolute and indispensable Obligation? If they are to obey, or disobey, just as they think fit, the Right of governing them is of no such great Value. The Church of *England* (he tells us in the same Page) "is founded upon the noble Claim of the Right of Christians to judge for themselves". It is so, and upon another Claim too, which is no less noble: I mean that of a Right in her self of being absolutely obeyed in Matters, either indifferent in themselves, or difficult
to

to be understood. Nor does this latter Claim interfere with the former.

What I have laid down, being duly attended to, it will be easy to give an Answer to every seeming Argument, or real Evasion in the Piece before us, so far as it relates to the Subject of my Discourse. I utterly deny therefore, that by our Concession concerning the Right of private Persons to examine, and their Duty not to obey what is contrary to Christ's Commands, we cut off, p. 41. all Interpretations of Christ's Laws, all imposed Terms, Creeds, Articles, &c. So far from it, that notwithstanding such our Concession, there is (and I still insist upon it) an indispensable Obligation upon the Subjects of Christ to an absolute Obedience to the meer Authority of the Church, in all those, and such like Instances, when Nothing appears contrary to the Word of God. For in these Cases we always mean Absolute with respect to Subjects, not to a Superior Power. We are not to obey the whole Civil Legislature, if the Matter of their Laws be contrary to God's: But it is to be hoped it does not therefore follow that the whole Civil Legislature has no Absolute Authority.

*A R E P L Y to the Bishop of Bangor, by
the Author of the Scourge.*

A Bishop must be blameless as the Steward of God, not self-willed, for there are many unruly and vain Talkers, whose Mouths must be stopped, Epist. to Titus, ch. i. 7, 10, 11.

THE Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy has been so venerably received in the English Nation, that it must be strangely disagreeable to hear the Character of a Bishop become the Scorn and Ridicule of a whole Kingdom, and made the Subject of the most vulgar and licentious Conversation: But more shocking, is the Reflection, when a Prelate has so far Abdicated the Dignity of his sacred Office, as to expose his Integrity to the universal Odium of Mankind, to give up the Rights of his holy Function, and, to all Appearance, approve himself an Apostate to his own Orders.

The

The Lower House of Convocation have bravely asserted the Honour of Religion, and of our Ecclesiastical Establishment; and his Lordship of *Bangor*, by this time, I suppose, is convinc'd how singular he is in his Opinions, and that it is not the general Belief of the Clergy of *England*, that our *Liturgy* is no more than *superstitious Folly*, our *Rubrick*, a *Rule of Art*; and that Repentance and a godly Sorrow depend only upon *Custom*, or *Constitution*, and are unnecessary *Terms of our Acceptance with God*: For my own Part, I humbly hope his Lordship will permit me without Censure, to join in the comon Service of our Church, till he is pleased to fulfil his Promise, and oblige us with a *New Form of Prayer*, of his own composing, which his Lordship (because I presume our *Established Form* is criminal and deficient) imagines he has now a just Occasion to trouble the World with. I humbly beg likewise, that notwithstanding his Lordship has told me, that no Man is either more or less sensible of his Sins for shedding or not shedding Tears, I may, if it should please God to afflict me with any dangerous Sickness, be allowed to have the Office for the Visitation of the Sick read to me, wherein the Priest implores the Divine Mercy to consider my Contrition, and accept my Tears; and this Favour I have some Assurance of, because his Lordship has been pleased to confess, that he endeavours to interpret the Doctrines of Christ, without the Thought that all who hear him are indispensably obliged to receive his Interpretation.

In a late Reign I find several Discourses published under the Titles of *The Reasonableness of Conformity to the Church of England*; *A Persuasive to Lay-Conformity*; *A Defence of Episcopal Ordination*; and *A Reply to Mr. Calamy, a Dissenting Teacher*, by Benjamin Hoadley, M. A. Rector of St. Peters Poor. And I have been often told, that this Divine was some Time ago advanced to the See of *Bangor*, and preached before the King at St. James's upon the 31st of March; but I have some Reason to believe, that my Information was a Mistake, and that his present Lordship of *Bangor*, and the late Rector of St. Peters are not the Same; their Schemes of Religion and Government are so widely distant, that if I follow the Instructions of Mr. Hoadley, I may, if I please, be a tolerable good Subject, and be persuaded that it is my Duty to conform to the Discipline and Doctrines of the Church; but if I am directed by his Lordship, I may lawfully think my self free from all Obedience to my Superiors, I may believe the Church of Christ to be a State of Anarchy and Confusion, that every

Man is left to do what is right in his own Eyes, and I may absolutely deny the Supremacy of my Sovereign; it must be excusable therefore when I appear in Vindication of honest Mr. Hoadly, and redeem his Character from that Infamy and Reproach, that have fallen upon the Principles of the Bishop: And to set this Matter in the clearest Light, I shall fairly produce a short Specimen in their own Words, and refer it to the Arbitration of all reasonable Men, whether it is possible that the same Person could ever be so lost to his Memory and Religion, as to be guilty of such contrary Positions, such monstrous and scandalous Contradictions.

The Reverend Mr. Hoadly.

I cannot answer to my own Conscience any Attempt which naturally tends to perpetuate our Divisions, to open our Wounds anew to raise the Passions, and cast a Cloud before the Judgment of the Reader.
Preface to the Reas. of Conf.

Bishops have Authority to prescribe for the better and more decent Administration of the Offices of Religion, for the Beauty and Advantage of that Christian Society in which they preside; this Power I lodge in the Hands of the Bishops, because in the first Ages of the Gospel, no Power in any Affairs relating to the Church, could be in any Hands but those of Ecclesiastical Officers; all Civil Magistrates being professed Enemies to the Christian Name. *Reply to Mr. Calamy,*
493.

The Reverend B. of Bangor.

I am far from saying I will answer for every Sentence in every Book of mine written long ago; worldly Grandeur, great Power, and Riches naturally tend to take off Mens Minds from true Religion and the true Motives of it.
Answer to Dr. Snape. page 45. 49.

As the Church of Christ is the Kingdom of Christ, he himself is King, he is the sole Lawgiver and sole Judge of his Subjects, in all Points relating to the Honour or Displeasure of Almighty God; and all his Subjects, in what Station soever they be, are equally Subjects to him; and no one of them any more than another, hath Authority either to make new Laws for Christ's, or to impose a Sense upon the old ones, which is the same Thing, in Matters relating purely to Conscience or
Salva.

Surely it must be true, that the present Governors of the Church succeed the Apostles in all that Power which is at present necessary to the well being of it. *Reply*, p. 496.

It is ever agreeable to God's Will whether declared in an express Text of Scripture or not, that such Things should be ordered and complied with, as are truly for the Interest of Religion, and the decent Celebration of the Office of Religion. *Reply* 494.

Occasional Communion prevents none of the evil Consequences of Separation, and removes not the Occasion of the Unchristian Behaviour among us. *Reply* 553.

I desire that a General Uniformity may be thought an Advantage to a Christian Nation, and that it may not be judged an unchristian or unfriendly Office to endeavour to promote it in the Way of fair and serious Reasoning. *Reply*, 521.

Who could think that when we are required to declare our Assent and Consent to the Use of all Things contained in the Book of

Salvation. Sermon on the 31st of March, pag. 11, 15, 16.

Christ hath left behind him no visible human Authority, who can be said properly to supply his Place; no Interpreters upon whom his Subjects are to depend; no Judges over the Consciences of Religion of his People. Ser. p. 11.

No one of Christ's Subjects is Lawgiver and Judge over others in Matters relating to Salvation, but he alone. Ser. p. 25.

I do not think any Man's Religion, considered in it self, an Argument why he should be deprived of any of the Common Rights of Society in this World. *Ans.* p. 35.

Men ought not to suffer in their Common Rights, for the sake of any meer Difference of Opinion in Religion, considered as such. *Ans.* p. 47.

If I have expressed too much concern for the true, legal and christian Liberty of the World about us, I hope they will at least pardon me so great an Injury. *Ans.* p. 4.

Humane Absolutions, humane Benedictions, humane Denunciations, humane Excommunications have nothing to do with the
E 2 Common

Common Prayer, that it should be thought a Difficulty that they should be sincere and unfeigned? unless there be any who could solemnly declare them without Sincerity or Intention of regarding such a Declaration? *Defens. of the Reas. of Conf.* p. 226, 227.

It concerns us all as much as the Favour of Almighty God concerns us, to have a sacred and constant Regard to Publick Peace and Unity. *Persu. Lay-Con.* p. 289.

It is an Obligation upon every Christian to conform himself to what is established, unless you will lay all Establishments open to infinite Divisions, and frustrate the very End for which alone they are designed. *Persu. Lay-Con.* 294.

In Theory it signifies little what a Man says, he may make what Ecclesiastical *Utopia's* he please, and indulge his own peculiar Judgment and Genius to the utmost. *Reply*, 524.

Favour or Anger of God; they are humane Engines permitted to work for a Time (like other Evils) by Providence, meer Durries of human Terror, vain Words! *Pref. p. 99, 101.*

Every one may find it in his own Conduct to be true, that his Title to God's Favour cannot depend upon his actual Being or Continuing in any particular Method, but upon his real Sincerity in the Conduct of his Conscience. *Pref. p. 90.*

For one Christian Divine to be told by another Christian Divine, that he contradicts Acts of Parliament, and Laws made by Men, has a very odd Appearance. *Ans. p. 36.*

Christ himself is King, and has left no Vicegerents who can be said properly to supply his Place; my Practice is all that Zeal, Duty and Submission which can result from the sincerest Affection to King George. *Ser. p. 11. Ans. p. 11.*

After this came out Dr. *Snape's* second Letter to the Bishop of *Bangor*, wherein, after the Return of a Compliment, he gives a Definition of Prayer, and shews how wide his Lordship's Notions are from our Saviour's Practice, and calls upon him to answer the Charge given against him

him in the first Letter, which the Doctor says he has carefully avoided, as not being agreeable to his Purpose. Page 31, he takes Notice that the Lord Bishop had promised to make Publick a Collection of his own Prayers, which the Doctor says we may make some Judgment from what he had wrote, of what sort they would be, and therefore begs Leave before they appear to enter a Caveat for the Security of unwary Christians. Then he proceeds to another Article, *viz. the Love of God*, which he repeats to the Bishop, that he had set as low as possible by excluding it as an Affection of the Mind, or Principle of Action, and confining it wholly to the elicite Acts resulting from it as a Principle; the Doctor supports this Charge by divers Texts of Scripture, and carries it home to his Lordship, concluding that Part of the Argument with a remarkable Sting, that his Sermon carried the Appearance of one uniform Design to sooth his Audience, to lull their Consciences asleep, and let them understand that they need not give themselves too much Trouble about Religion.

As for the third Head, *viz. the Church of Christ*, the Doctor takes upon him to answer only in the general, because, as he says, it affects equally the whole Representative Body of the Clergy; however, in this he takes Notice of his mysterious and puzzling Way of Writing, his Evasions, and handling the Word of God deceitfully, so much unbecoming the Character of a Bishop; and, after all, as an Instance of the Bishop's Sincerity, charges him with a Point of Fact, bidding him lay his Hand to his Heart and determine with himself, whether the Words *Absolutely and Properly* (on which Words lay a great Stress so far as regarding the Absolute Authority of the Church of Rome, or the Authority of the Church of England) were not omitted in his Sermon as it was originally composed; and whether he did not before it was preached shew it to a certain Person without such Limitation, who prevailed with Difficulty upon his Lordship to insert those Words, by way of Caution, telling him, that if he thought fit to answer the World in the Negative, he would engage that a Person of unquestionable Veracity, of as high and sacred a Station as his Lordship, would Charge himself with the Proofs of the Affirmative. The Doctor, in the following Pages, makes merry with the Bishop's Syllogisms, and proves them both illegal and inconclusive; and that by his Lordship's Reasoning the Devils may be
Members

Members of Christ's Church ; and in the Conclusion of his Letter charges him, with keeping a Jesuit in his House, who is his intimate Companion and Confident ; that his Lordship's Discourse favours very strongly of such a Communication, and questions whether that same Person might not have help'd the Bishop to a mental Reservation to justify his Appeal to God, that what he preached was without the Knowledge of any Man living, when a living Man had testified that it was preached with his Knowledge and submitted to his Correction.

This second Letter of Dr. *Snape's* nettled the Bishop more than any Thing else, because of the heavy Accusations as his Lordship says in the following Advertisement, it contained, who with much Heat, as soon as ever it came to his Hands, (which was sent by the Doctor the Day before its Publication,) drew up the Advertisement, and caused it to be inserted in the *Post-Boy*, and other publick Papers ; Dr. *Snape* was as quick as his Lordship, and answered his Demand in the *Evening-Post* the same Day, so far as he was concerned, or as much as he knew of the Matter ; for the Story being shuffled on the Right Reverend Bishop of *Carlisle*, the Bishop of *Bangor*, in the following Publick News Paper, caused to be inserted another Advertisement, wherein he calls upon the Bishop of *Carlisle* in as strict a Manner as he had before done upon the Doctor ; continuing at the same Time such solemn Protestations, as, considering the Character of the Man, no Body can think him guilty of what's laid to his Charge : And on the other Hand, if those worthy Divines have alledged what does not *absolutely* or *properly* belongs to him, or what's equivalent, what they are not able to prove. I think his Lordship has good Reason to turn all that *Calmness* and *Undisturbedness* of Temper he heretofore possess'd, into *Heat* and *Flame*, however contradictory they may seem to the rest of Mankind.

However, the Bp. of *Carlisle* not thinking himself oblig'd IMMEDIATELY to answer his t'other Lordship, because his Lordship of *Bangor* can claim no *absolute Authority* over him, therefore has likewise published an Advertisement to let the World know that the worthy Man that had advis'd the Bishop, corrected his Sermon, &c. would himself, he expected, do Justice to the Controversie so as to unriddle the Mystery, till which Time we find that Gentleman in the Humour, we must, as Necessity obliges, conclude for the present this Dispute, with the following Advertisements we have been speaking of.

Whereas

WHereas the Rev. Dr. *Snape*, in his 1st Letter to the Bp. of *Bangor*, had thought fit in Pag. 40, to leave the Argument; and to lay a very heavy Accusation upon me, in the following Words, *viz.* 'I pray recollect your self, and put these plain Questions home to your own Conscience: Whether your *Absolutely's* and *Properly's*, and such like evasive Words, were not omitted in your Sermon, as it was originally composed: Whether you did or not, before it was preached, shew it a certain Person without such Limitations, and whether you was not without Difficulty prevailed upon by him, to insert them by Way of Caution: If you think fit to answer the World in the Negative, I engage that a Person of unquestionable Veracity, of as high and sacred a Station as your Lordship, will charge himself with the Proof of the Affirmative.' And whereas that Reverend Doctor, in p. 67 of this second Letter, hath thought fit, in a Manner hardly to be paralleled, to insinuate that the Bishop hath a Mental Reservation to justify his solemn Appeal to God, that what he preached was without the Knowledge of any Man living; when (as the Doctor adds) a living Man hath testified that it was preached with his Knowledge, and submitted to his Correction: In a Case of this Nature I can do nothing but appeal to the World in the Manner following. I have recollected my self, and put these Questions home to my own Conscience: And I do here solemnly aver, that the Words mentioned, as evasive Words, not only were in the Sermon originally, but were intended and designed to be so; that I did not, before it was preached, shew it to any Person in the World, either with, or without such Limitations; and consequently could not possibly be perswaded by any Person to insert those Words; and that I think I have given the World sufficient Proof of my Regard to plain and open speaking, by what I have experienced upon that Account only. And having thus solemnly answered the World in the Negative; I do here, in the most publick Manner, call upon the Doctor by all the Regard due to Conscience and Honour; I expect, I require him, by all the Ties of Christian Duty, either to make publick Reparation for so uncommon an Injury in so tender a Point; or to produce immediately that Worthy Person of the same High and Sacred Station, who, he engages, will charge himself with the Proof of the Affirmative: And likewise to name that Living Man, who, he affirms, hath testified that the Sermon was preached with his Knowledge, and submitted to his

his Correction. I do here demand this ; and put the whole of my Reputation upon this single Point. If the Reverend Dr. *Snape* doth not immediately, either acknowledge his Mistake, or make good what he hath engaged ; he must be content to be thought, by all the World, what I will not say. In the mean while, I pray God to put a Stop to such Behaviour of Divines, as brings an Infamy upon the Christian Name. I forgive it from the Bottom of my Soul ; and, I thank God, I am in such a Disposition of Mind, as that I could die sooner than give or return such Usage, as I have met with, through this whole Controversy.

BENJ. BANGOR,

Eton, June 28, 1717.

WHereas the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of *Bangor* has published an Advertisement in the *Daily Courant* of this Day, requiring me to produce the Worthy Person, that will charge himself with the Proof of a Fact, charged on his Lordship by me, page 40 of my second Letter ; I hereby declare, that I first received that Account from a * Worthy Di- * Dr. *Hutchinson*, vine, who assured me, he heard the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of *Carlisle* declare, that he had spoke with the Person who advised my Lord of *Bangor*, upon reading his Sermon, to insert such Words as *Absolutely*, &c. That some Days after, the same Divine did again assure me, he had heard the same Worthy Prelate a second Time declare that Matter to be true, and that he would justify it to all the World. Upon which I drew up that Passage, waited on my Lord Bishop of *Carlisle*, read the Passage to him, and was allowed by him to publish it, with an Assurance, that he would stand to it. And I question not but his Lordship, on whose Testimony I relied, will give my Lord of *Bangor* full Satisfaction.

A. SNAPE

This is true. W. CARLIOL

FE T N T S

